

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ROBERT ALEXANDER GRIMSLEY,

CASE NO. C23-1894

Plaintiff,

ORDER

V.

NIKE, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Michelle L. Peterson's

Report and Recommendation (R&R). Dkt. 4. Pro se prisoner plaintiff Robert Grimsley seeks to sue Nike (and perhaps 500 other entities or persons) under RICO for

“kidnapping” him, though it appears Grimsley is incarcerated at the Snake River

Correctional Institute in Ontario, Oregon. He did not pay the filing fee and he did not

apply to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The R&R recommends dismis

www.merriam-webster.com

U.S.C. § 1915(g), Grimesley is not entitled to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this Court.

1 Grimsley has not objected to the R&R, or explained why he has not paid the filing
2 fee. He did file a motion asking Judge Peterson to recuse herself from the case, and
3 asking this Court to “dismiss” the R&R. Dkt. 7. The former request is directed to Judge
4 Peterson, but it is untimely, and Grimsley has provided no justification warranting a
5 referral to Judge Peterson to consider his request in the first instance. Requiring a litigant
6 who is not eligible for *in forma pauperis* status to pay the filing fee is not evidence of
7 bias. Because Grimsley has not paid the filing fee, the case is subject to dismissal, and the
8 court will not “dismiss” or otherwise overrule the R&R.

9 A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge’s proposed
10 disposition to which a party has properly objected. It must modify or set aside any portion
11 of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

12 The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition;
13 receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.
14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A proper objection requires “specific written objections to the
15 proposed findings and recommendations” in the R&R. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). “[I]n
16 providing for a de novo determination . . . Congress intended to permit whatever reliance
17 a district judge, in the exercise of sound judicial discretion, chose to place on a
18 magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *United States v. Raddatz*, 447
19 U.S. 667, 676 (1980) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, when a district
20 court adopts a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the district court is required to merely
21 “indicate[] that it reviewed the record de novo, found no merit to . . . [the] objections, and
22 summarily adopt[s] the magistrate judge’s analysis in [the] report and recommendation.”

1 *United States v. Ramos*, 65 F.4th 427, 433 (9th Cir. 2023). In so doing, district courts are
2 “not obligated to explicitly address [the] objections.” *Id.* at 437.

3 The Court has reviewed the record de novo and finds no merit to Grimsley’s
4 claims, or to his subsequent filing. He has not paid the filing fee and he is not entitled to
5 proceed *in forma pauperis*. The R&R is **ADOPTED**. The case is **DISMISSED** without
6 prejudice and without leave to amend. All other pending motions are denied as moot.

7 The Clerk shall enter a **JUDGMENT** and close the case.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated this 16th day of April, 2024.

10 
11 _____
12 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22